

Campaign	
<p>Helen S. Kawagoe, MMC City of Carson Dated June 21, 2002 Our File Number: A-02-109</p>	<p>The one-bank account rule and when campaign funds may be used for legal defense is discussed. How section 85304 is inapplicable to local candidates is also addressed.</p>
<p>Kellie Bewley Amalgamated Transit Union Dated June 25, 2002 Our File Number: A-02-126</p>	<p>Campaign contribution limits of sections 85301 and 85302 of the Political Reform Act for candidates running for Assembly, Senate, state and local offices is discussed. The Act's contribution limits do not apply to elections for local office.</p>
<p>LeeAnn Pelham, Executive Director City of Los Angeles Ethics Commission Dated June 3, 2002 Our File Number: I-02-137</p>	<p>A review of state law issues contained in a fact sheet prepared by the Los Angeles City Ethics Commission in connection with the San Fernando Valley secession election. Also reviews applicable state law, and states that under section 84215(e), the Los Angeles City Ethics Commission is the filing officer for campaign statements filed in the secession election.</p>
<p>Keith S. Richman, M.D. California Assembly Dated June 21, 2002 Our File Number: I-02-143</p>	<p>An Assembly member may transfer startup funds from his Assembly committee to his new municipal committee. If elected mayor of the proposed new city, the conflict-of-interest provisions of section 87100 would apply to him. Under section 85702, a lobbyist who is registered to lobby the Legislature is prohibited from making a contribution from his or her personal funds to the Assembly member's state committee or his new municipal committee.</p>
Conflict of Interest	
<p>Lynn Tracy Nerland, Asst. City Attorney City of Emeryville Dated June 19, 2002 Our File Number: I-02-059</p>	<p>In applying regulation 18707.1(b)(1)(B), two individuals who jointly own a home that is their domicile or principal place of residence count as two "homeowners."</p>
<p>Thomas F. Nixon, City Attorney Placentia City Council Dated June 26, 2002 Our File Number: A-02-081</p>	<p>A city council member who is a local real estate broker and investor in a business owning real property within 500 feet of a redevelopment area seeks to vote on proposals to sell property located in the redevelopment area, purchase property adjacent to the redevelopment area, and improve a commercial parcel located in the redevelopment area. Decisions to buy and sell property are of the type to affect the redevelopment area as a whole. The council member has a disqualifying conflict of interest by virtue of his investment in a business entity owning real property within 500 feet of the redevelopment area</p>

<p>Alfred G. Vazquez Lassen Municipal Utility District Dated June 13, 2002 Our File Number: A-02-086</p> <p>Patrick C. Wilson, Asst. City Attorney City of Santa Rosa Dated June 3, 2002 Our File Number: I-02-093</p> <p>Gregory V. Moser City of Monterey Park Dated June 6, 2002 Our File Number: I-02-114</p> <p>George Maurer, Councilmember City of Sierra Madre Dated June 14, 2002 Our File Number: A-02-131</p> <p>Steven P. Rudolph, City Attorney City of Folsom Dated June 27, 2002 Our File Number: A-02-145</p> <p>Susan A. Shaheen, Ph.D. Partners for Advanced Transit & Highways Dated June 10, 2002 Our File Number: A-02-148</p>	<p>boundaries. The decision concerning the commercial parcel is not of the same type and affects only that discrete parcel within the redevelopment area. Since this parcel is located more than 500 feet from the council member's investment property, there is no disqualifying conflict of interest and he may vote on improvements to that parcel.</p> <p>It is not reasonably foreseeable that a public official's particular economic interest will be materially affected by a decision to pay a monthly agency bill.</p> <p>A planning commissioner does not have an economic interest in the clients of his employer when he has neither ownership interest nor investment in that company. The elements to apply the "reasonably foreseeable" standard in the conflict-of-interest analysis is outlined.</p> <p>A city council member has a conflict of interest in a decision to reconsider a contract with a towing company that has its site of operation within 500 feet of the council member's property. The effect of appraisals is discussed.</p> <p>A city council member does not have a conflict of interest in a decision regarding the Sierra Madre Conservancy as a result of being a former director on the board of the conservancy.</p> <p>A city manager whose residence is more than 500 feet beyond property to be rezoned for high density development, whose spouse is employed by a non-profit rental housing association, does not have a conflict of interest in rezoning decisions.</p> <p>A clarification was sought that prior advice regarding a potential grant application by the University of California did not bar a UC employee from assisting in preparing the application, when the grantor is another state agency to which the UC employee is detailed on a part-time basis. The employee was advised that no conflict of interest exists unless the employee were to seek funds in her individual capacity as a private person. No conflict exists when applying on behalf of the University of California for grant monies.</p>
---	--

<p>Cindie K. McMahon City of Carlsbad Dated June 25, 2002 Our File Number: A-02-150</p> <p>Kathleen Walsh, General Counsel Air Resources Board Dated June 25, 2002 Our File Number: I-02-158</p> <p>Anne A. Lee City of Monterey Park Dated June 25, 2002 Our File Number: I-02-160</p> <p>Linda L. Daube City of Pittsburg Dated June 25, 2002 Our File Number: I-02-161</p> <p>Stacey Simon Mono County Dated June 27, 2002 Our File Number: I-02-163</p>	<p>A current member of a city's parks and recreation commission wished to sell life insurance policies to the same city. As long as the member does not act in his official capacity when introducing and/or selling the life insurance policies, there is no conflict of interest under the Political Reform Act.</p> <p>A general discussion of conflict-of-interest laws as applied to a member of the Agricultural Advisory Committee of the Air Resources Board.</p> <p>A follow-up advice letter to <i>Moser</i> Advice Letter No. I-02-114. Reiterates the effect of appraisals on the evaluation of materiality.</p> <p>An employee of a local developer referred the mayor to a local businessman whose business became the source of a real estate loan to the mayor. In the absence of a referral fee or business affiliation between the local developer and the lending business, the developer is not a source of income to the mayor, and does not number among his economic interests. The mayor does not have a conflict of interest and may vote on projects proposed by the developer.</p> <p>A non-profit entity is not a "public official" under the Act and is not, therefore, subject to the Act's conflict-of-interest provisions.</p>
---	--

Conflict of Interest Code	
<p>Mike Stoker Deputy Secretary of State Dated June 7, 2002 Our File Number: A-02-130</p>	<p>Members of a voting modernization board will be required to file statements of economic interests once a conflict of interest code has been approved for the board.</p>
<p>Kathryn Doi California Technology, Trade and Commerce Agency Dated June 25, 2002 Our File Number: A-02-025</p>	<p>A state advisory commission is advised on whether it must adopt a conflict of interest code. The <i>Siegel</i> factors to determine whether the advisory commission is a state agency are also discussed.</p>
Mass Mailing	
<p>Leslie Cook, CMC City of Santa Cruz Dated June 19, 2002 Our File Number: I-02-123</p>	<p>The current mass mailing statute and regulations only apply to tangible items and not the Internet. Newsletters affiliated with the elected officer and acting in “cooperation, consultation, coordination, or concert” with the creators of the newsletter are subject to the mass mailing rules.</p>
Revolving Door	
<p>Steven F. Scholl California Coastal Commission Dated June 25, 2002 Our File Number: I-02-083</p>	<p>The deputy director of the California Coastal Commission sought advice concerning post-employment restrictions in connection with the intent to engage in private consulting for local government agency clients concerning local coastal programs and amendments thereto. An official is not barred by the one-year ban from advising clients, provided that the official is not identified in any client communications, oral or written, submitted to the California Coastal Commission. The official may have no oral or written communication with the California Coastal Commission for one year, except to solicit information in the public record. The official is permanently barred from representing clients in the proceedings in which he personally and substantially participated as a state official, including matters conducted by employees under his direct supervision.</p>
<p>Jacquelyn Paige California Health Policy & Data Advisory Commission Dated June 5, 2002 Our File Number: I-02-122</p>	<p>A general discussion of how post-governmental restrictions will apply once a state employee leaves office. Influencing a prospective employer is discussed and checking the agency’s statement of incompatible activities is also advised.</p>

Gregory S. Schuett California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection Dated June 27, 2002 Our File Number: I-02-144	General guidance regarding post-governmental employment provisions of the Political Reform Act.
§ 84308	
Harriet A. Steiner Sacramento Metropolitan Cable Television Commission Dated June 5, 2002 Our File Number: A-02-095	Section 84308 in this letter applies to the cable commission's consideration of the proposed change in control of the cable franchise brought about by the merger of AT&T and Comcast. Agents under section 84308, aggregation of contributions by the party and an agent, and when commissioners have knowledge of a proceeding and a contribution are also discussed.
Miscellaneous	
Marcia H. Armstrong Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors Dated June 26, 2002 Our File Number: I-02-165	The Fair Political Practices Commission interprets and enforces the provisions of the Political Reform Act. A question concerning an individual's attendance as "supervisor-elect" at social, community and civic events before the supervisor's term begins, is a question that should be directed to the county counsel.